



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/511,777	02/24/2000	Okoziem Allen	2204/A14	5651

2101 7590 10/09/2002

BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP  
125 SUMMER STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110-1618

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2002

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ps

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/511,777

Applicant(s)

ALLEN ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2156

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2156

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 16 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Beser U.S. Patent No. 6189102.

3. Referencing claim 1, Beser teaches a method for representing addressing information in a communication system, the method comprising encoding at least one address using a regular expression and using the regular expression in place of the at least one address, (e.g. col. 35, lines 6 – 32).

Art Unit: 2156

4. Referencing claim 4, Beser teach wherein the at least one address comprises at least one MAC address, (e.g. col. 35, lines 6 – 32).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beser (6189102) in view of Ankney et al. (5113499) (hereinafter Ankney).

7. As per claim 2, Beser does not specifically teach at least one address comprises at least one X.121 address. Ankney teaches at least one address comprises at least one X.121 address, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankney with Beser because if a user needed to utilize a system that used X.121, it would be more efficient to have a diverse system with multiple addressing schemes.

8. As per claim 3, Beser does not specifically teach using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address configuration table. Ankney teaches using the regular expression in place of the at least

Art Unit: 2156

one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address configuration table, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Ankney with Beser because it is more convenient for a user to use a name for an address rather than a stream of numbers.

9. Claims 5, 7 – 12, 13 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beser (6189102) in view of Belser et al. (6151324) (hereinafter Belser).

10. As per claim 5, Beser does not specifically teach wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address configuration table. Belser teaches wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address configuration table, (e.g. col. 4, line 55 – col. 5, line 8). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Belser with Beser because it is more convenient for a user to use a name for an address rather than a stream of numbers.

11. As per claim 7, Beser does not specifically teach wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a management information base. Belser teaches wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a management information base, (e.g. col. 10, lines 20 – 45). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2156

combine Belser with Beser because it allows a network manager monitor packets to ensure that transmission is successful and that devices are available in the network.

12. As per claim 10, Beser teaches wherein the regular expression defines a source address group, (e.g. col. 10, lines 20 – 45).

13. As per claim 13, Beser teaches wherein the storage comprises a routing table, (e.g. col. 20, lines 23 – 48 & col. 22, line 60 – col. 23, line 9).

14. As per claim 14, Beser teaches wherein the regular expression defines a forwarding equivalence class for a routing table entry, (e.g. col. 20, lines 23 – 48 & col. 22, line 60 – col. 23, line 9).

15. Claims 8, 9, 11, 15, 16 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

16. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beser (6189102) in view of Peacock (6381650).

17. As per claim 6, Beser does not specifically teach wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises using the regular expression to specify at least one address of an address pool. Peacock teaches wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises using the regular expression to specify at least one address of an address pool, (e.g. col. 3, lines 19 – 40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at

Art Unit: 2156

the time of the invention to combine Peacock with Beser because it is more efficient to have a regular expression to signify a pool of addresses then having multiple regular expressions for a pool of addresses. This could save space in address tables and time in packet switching.

18. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beser (6189102) in view of Belser (6151324) in further view of Peacock (6381650).

19. As per claim 12, Beser and Belser do not specifically teach wherein the regular expression defines an address pool. Peacock teaches wherein the regular expression defines an address pool, (e.g. col. 3, lines 19 – 40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peacock with the combine system of Beser and Belser because it is more efficient to have a regular expression to signify a pool of addresses then having multiple regular expressions for a pool of addresses. This could save space in address tables and time in packet switching.

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

21. a. Ahmed et al. U.S. Patent No. 6160804 discloses Mobility management for a multimedia mobile network.

22. b. Engel et al. U.S. Patent No. 6115393 discloses Network monitoring.

23. c. Lecheler et al. U.S. Patent No. 6425008 discloses System and Method for remote management of private networks having duplicate network addresses.

Art Unit: 2156

24. d. Dev et al. U.S. Patent No. 6216168 discloses Perspective-bases shared scope address resolution method and apparatus.
25. e. Sojoodi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6437805 discloses System and method for accessing object capabilities in a graphical program.
26. f. Bahlmann U.S. Patent No. 6393478 discloses Cable modem and personal computer troubleshooting tool.
27. g. Kadambi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6104696 discloses Method for sending packets between trunk ports of network switches.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333.


The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2156

De   
October 3, 2002

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100